

The program which is recorded here is a talk show called Hanny's People, and the host is a Black Detroit called Don Hanny, and the guest on this particular show is Victor Marchetti, who is presented on Detroit Channel 7, WXYZ, from 2-3 o'clock on Sunday, November 21. The program at the beginning of this tape had already been in progress for about five minutes.

WXYZ-TV is a part of the American Broadcasting System.

ABM can more than justify their own programs and when the CIA is preparing, in coordination with the rest of the Intelligence Community, a report on this subject; and I even did some work on these; these colonels and navy commanders will drag their feet and argue and argue with you, and try to get that estimate to be as high as possible. If they can't get it high enough to justify their own program, then they'll go into delaying tactics to prevent the estimates from coming out on time, so that it will not be available for the Secretary of Defense or the President at this decision point, when he has to decide whether to go through more missiles or not. They use these sorts of techniques.

What do they call their situations like we have in Viet Nam?

They were just terrible. They constantly wanted to turn out reports to the President saying that they were killing all sorts of Viet Cong, North Vietnamese, and that victory was right around the corner. If they would have had their way, we would have wiped out North Viet Nam on paper.       ?       arguing and fighting with them. This

- READERS: See last 3 grafs, pp 20, 21. AMT

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP74B00415R000400160001-6

is a good example of things that are played up in estimates, well beyond its usefulness to the President, and they delayed so long that they had to send a key amount to Viet Nam to sit down with the Intelligence Officer on the scene, eventually working out some kind of a compromise, but they got the figures they wanted from the President's decision concerning this.

It's quite certain then that we may have lost more men in the Viet Nam War than was admitted?

You mean Americans?

Yes.

I don't know about that; I think we know how many men we were and how many men were wounded, but I think we lost more men than we needed to, actually.

There are several considerations that have to be brought into play here like from your point of view, "prize figures are remote to the American people, that indicate that we lost more men than the military really wanted us to know about". Isn't the danger inherent in that situation, isn't the danger to morale very significant, not only to our soldiers in Viet Nam, but to the American people as a whole?

Yes. Whenever you get into misinformation or false information you run this risk. On our losses in Viet Nam in terms of men, I'm just not that familiar with the situation.

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP74B00415R000400160001-6

You've been heard to complain about the current regime in South Viet Nam not being able to conduct an election that even looks on the up and up...

Yes.

Do you think the CIA is involved in any way in that election?

My guess would be that they were under instructions, since I'm no longer with the agency, but based on the way things used to go when I was there, my guess is that they were under instructions to try to get Theiu to run something that looked legitimate, if not actually legitimate.

He couldn't carry it out. (comment)

He evidently didn't want to carry it out. This is the kind of a bind you get yourself in when you, in order to prevent this ogre of Communism from taking control over a piece of jungle like Viet Nam, that you would back anybody that will fight against it. This is the kind of box you get yourself into; you end up backing a Theiu and a Ky, who are from the North to begin with, who are not very, very much in touch with the people, who are really corrupt and everybody knows its corrupt down there. So you're ending up backing the wrong horse, and you cannot turn back the cultural clock. These people have had it with this kind of government. But these guys have means and they can say, "I'm the only thing you have, if I want to do it

this way you have to ride along with me or else." And the United States Government, for some strange reason, cannot bring itself to say, "Look, if you don't do it the right way, there is no support at all; and damn it, we don't care if you lose out."

I understand that you are convinced that the CIA engineered the '62 overthrow of the Diem Regime in South Viet Nam.

Yes, I am.

On what do you base that?

Largely on what I've heard from senior officers in the Agency, some of whom were involved to some extent in it, and from some men who served in the area. I had it pretty clear that the CIA, under instructions from the President, was trying to eliminate the Diem Regime at that time. They were in contact with the military who were going to perform the coup. Now precisely how much guidance and support the CIA was giving, I don't know and I guess we never will know. One of the things in the business is to cover your tracks well enough so that the true story will never come out. But we were obviously supporting the colonels, and when the infantry men came and machine-gunned him and his brother, I think that came as a surprise. But the ambassador, Lodge, at the time he was aware of this. Information has been made public in recent years which I think clearly established this.

Has the CIA agreed to any activities that the President knows nothing about?

Well, it's one of these things, the President just cannot be aware of everything that goes on in the Government, nor can the Director of Central Intelligence be aware of everything that goes on in his Agency. But generally speaking, the real important things will be made known to the President.

You just made a very \_\_\_\_\_? that the CIA director can't know everything that goes on within the Central Intelligence Agency. Still, there have been a few distressing letters, that there are probably many activities in which the CIA is engaged which the Director knows absolutely nothing about. Would they, the CIA, could they well be engaged in some clandestine activity that the Director knows nothing?

Yes, that's a possibility, but it's the kind of activities, generally worded, it would not be anything that the team for the President would consider extremely important.

But if he doesn't know, how can he make that kind of decision?

In fact, occasionally there are flaps that occur and when they do, it turns out he is not being informed by his own men. There were cases when I was in the Agency, they had some problems in the field...(Where?) at the University, there are a couple of flaps right here in this country. It turned out that, not only the Director, but nobody in the executive suite had a clear idea of what the Agency's relationships were with the universities, and we actually had to get together and he assigned his number three man head of the committee, which I worked

along with several other senior officers, and it took us, I guess a good month, to find out the full extent of the CIA's relationship with the American universities. And even then I had the feeling that there were a few things we never did ferret out from the boys.

Here we would like to ferret out from you your explanation of flaps.

We'll get to that after this time out.

This is because the nature of the business is secret and dealing and living in the shadows. So if something the Agency is involved in will result in publicity, even if it's favorable publicity, it's considered a flap, but if it's bad publicity we are caught out on a limb, or a hand in the cookie jar, that's bad.

Was the CIA involved in any of the disturbances on campuses?

They were obviously the cause of some of these disturbances. Students picketed the recruiters when they came on campus. On several occasions when students learned that the CIA supported research programs and other activities, they raised a fuss, but they were not, at least in the time I was there, engaged in any hanky-panky on campus.

Of course the euphemism, hanky-panky, could mean a lot of things to a lot of people in a lot of different situations.

In this case I will throw a phrase at you and I would like to have you expand on that in any way that you like: terminate the subject.

All right, that's the term that a great deal of publicity, as a

result of the Green Beret troops in Viet Nam, and they eliminated or terminated an agent, whom they found out to be a double-agent.

After the facts. (comment)

After the facts.

Well, anything can happen. (comment)

Yes, well, evidently he was working for them, and then, I'm not sure in this case whether he's a provocationist, whether he's working for the opposition and we can't see him, or whether the opposition got to him after he worked for the Green Berets and then returned. In that case he is a double agent, in their opinion. They say that this was determined by their contact with the CIA, and they understood it to mean to kill him.

Is this a term with many uses?

I've never heard it used in that way, they like to use the term terminate; to terminate an agent could mean anything from a...

Removing him from an assignment?

Yes, to whatever you want it to mean. And this depended all on the case itself, the people involved in it, and the way this is carried out depends, as you say, on the actual case. I've never heard of a terminate if he's being \_\_\_\_? \_\_\_\_\_. Although a...

Could have been?

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP74B00415R000400160001-6  
Could have been. Yes.

Does the CIA assassinate people?

In the time in the years that I was there, I never knew of them to directly attack anyone.

Have you ever known them to cause the assassination of anyone?

I would say that in the espionage game, particularly when you get into political actions, the paramilitary activities, the situation moves so fast and it is so difficult to control. The CIA officer's role is to stay back out of shooting range, so to speak, and try to manipulate the go-betweens, the cut-outs, the contacts. Now if someone he is controlling, either directly or through some other agents, gets into the situations as they did when the colonels killed Diem and his brother, you could say, I guess, that the CIA was in some way responsible for the assassination, but you could never really establish this in a legal sense. They are, I guess, much too sophisticated, much too clever to involve themselves in anything like that. It's much better that the situation resolve itself in the feeling that it's beyond their control.

You just said sophisticated and clever. Do you think that the Intelligence, which goes back to something I mentioned earlier, that the Intelligence Gathering Community effectively controls the White House. Now you could very easily sell the President a bill of goods \_\_\_\_? \_\_\_\_.



Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP74B00415R000400160001-6

This is a possibility, as in any organization. I don't think it is happening now, but it is a possibility, and as any organization, a secret organization gets bigger and more powerful, this possibility becomes stronger. This is why it is so important, first of all, to have greater control over the Agency and the Intelligence Community, through Congress as well as through the administration. Secondly, all of their activities should be made known to the public as well as to Congress, so that we'll feel confident we know what they are doing and why they are doing it, where the money is going...

But how could we possibly feel confident we know what's going on? You mentioned earlier, there are a number of activities in which the CIA is engaged, that not even the Director of the CIA knows anything about.

And we can never be sure in this business, as Intelligence is a very dangerous business, it's a very difficult business to control. You can only take certain actions such as I've been describing. Another one is to make the heads of Intelligence civilians who are responsible to the President and the Congress as opposed to professionals who have worked their way up the ladder. I think, as the British do, that the experts should be kept on tap, but never on top. Which is another thing that we can never be absolutely sure, and there is a certain amount of faith involved. You just have to have faith in the men who you are giving responsibility to, faith in your controls, and in the various directions, directive measures that you have established are working. But to really keep the faith is constantly viewing, con-

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP74B00415R000400160001-6

stantly having the people report in to you, question them on various activities. Not let them hide behind the skirts of the National Security on every issue, or get away with executives presently do not have to answer to Congress. Letting the sun shine in a little bit, let's hang up the rock, so to speak, the chances are you'll keep it a little more honest.

Should there be in anyone in the spying business, that could be trusted completely?

Well, that's a tough question, Don, I think there are times when actually you have to trust them completely, or you should. Like, you just have to use common sense, and be on a case-by-case basis, know your man. If you are confident in him, you feel that his beliefs run parallel to yours, then I think you can't be more willing to trust him; but it's a tricky business.

Another aspect and element to the spy business I would like to talk to you about; that is, unless you feel that by revealing information that I am going to ask you about will constitute a breach of national security, I am interested in the kinds of sophisticated equipment that the CIA uses. What kind of equipment is it?

Well, some of it is very sophisticated.

Can you give me an example?

Yes, I'll give you several examples. The U-2, when it came out, was a great advance in the knowledge of aircraft. This was developed by the CIA. The SR-71, which was the aircraft that came out a few years later. President Johnson \_\_\_\_\_? \_\_\_\_\_ in Tennessee one day, called in 200 reporters and told them a secret and that blew the whole thing. But these were tremendous advances in overhead reconnaissance for their time period. We were taking pictures from great distances up where the aircraft is out of range of enemy missiles and even so high up that when the enemy radar operator saw it on the screen, they couldn't believe it, they thought they were seeing some sort of aberration on the screen.

What...If a...That, as I recall, is equipped with a destruct mechanism, is it not?

It is supposed to be, yes.

I have one more question that I'd like to get a quick answer from before we go to a commercial break. He was told, as I understand it, Gary Powers, that if he got into trouble, if he had to leave the ship, to press that button which was connected to a timing device which would give him plenty of time to get away from that airplane safely. Was it affixed to a timing device or was it in fact a device designed not only to destroy the airplane but Gary Powers as well?

I don't really know, Don. All I know is he didn't use what he had and ended up being captured and some people didn't think highly of him for it but it happened and there seems to be nothing we can do about it now.

When we come back I have some other questions I'd like to ask you, Rich Marchetti, our guest and former CIA official and the author of a recently published book called, "\_\_\_\_\_". We'll be right back.

I think they are difficult to answer because, I don't want to, first of all, I don't want to reveal information that I consider would be harmful to the national security, and I do want to reveal information I think would be helpful in getting some action and interest on the part of the people.

Have I asked you any questions that ordinarily you would answer without thinking a great deal about the effects of jeopardizing national security?

Well, I'd say no, it's just if I answer in greater detail, it could have an effect on national security.

Which question is that?

I'm not going to tell you.

OK. Are there any circumstances under which an agent is instructed to commit suicide?

There was a time when this was done in the business. When I was a young fellow in training in the agency at Camp Nowhere, which is a term of endearment for one the favorite camps where young officers are trained, we were told about cyanide pills and these sort of

things and we were assured that that was a hangover from OSS days, the war time situation and that no one would be asked to give his life in that fashion without the direct approval of the director himself. This also is the deal with murder, too, if in the course of an operation an opponent has to be eliminated.

Do you say there has been circumstances under which the director has given his OK for the murder of an individual or individuals?

Not that I am aware of, no. I don't think he would. I don't think he'd ever find any situation that sensitive that it would be necessary, but I wouldn't know.

It seems to me that what you are saying is that when you recruit an individual to become a CIA agent, you don't tell him, you don't give him that information that could be used against the Agency itself.

Absolutely not, you don't want that to happen.

How is it possible not to reveal certain secrets to that agent?

Well, he is basically a collection agent; that is, a man who is going to acquire information for you. We have various ways of confusing him. You could tell him, "I'd like to know more information about this, this, and this," when you are really only interested in the second one. You never show what you are really interested in. There are all sorts of professional techniques like this. Obviously when you are in a political action or para-military situation where you can't do that, "Go in there and get that installation and blow it up."

Then you have to take him into your confidence that far. There are certain advantages you have, of course, if you are going to drop him into the zone; he is relying on you to get him in there safe and get him out again, and it really comes down to man-to-man evaluation and these are some of the things I wanted to bring out in my novel. The Case Officer has got to really understand his agent and got to feel for him and vice versa, he has got to get the agent in the same position. If they really trust each other and believe in each other they can just about do anything together.

Sorry to keep you along at this point. The question I am going to ask you does in a sense, affect a jumping around. I would like to get back to sophisticated equipment if we can, a subject that we glazed over. What other kinds of equipment can you think of that are so sophisticated as to bother the average American agent?

I can think of several, Don, but I am not going to talk about them because this is the part of intelligence that I thoroughly believe and I think is very legitimate and this is where the bulk of the money and talent is spent. Collecting information on enemies and potential enemies for our protection; detectives, thieves, \_\_\_\_\_, if you don't mind the pun, are very sophisticated and very good. Many, many feel that they have made great contributions to the art.

You can't give me a more precise example?

No. Some of it has to do with overhead reconnaissance, some of it has to do with electronics and so forth; but no, this I wouldn't want to speak about because I think it is very important that the United

States know what its rivals in the international arena are doing and this is the only way we have of finding out.

How does one become a CIA agent?

Through various ways. You can be recruited, as I was at a university. I had been in military intelligence in the Army, and then I went back to school and studied-specialized in Soviet Studies. A professor who was in contact with the Agency spotted me and got to know me and thought I might work out. A recruiter came by and called me up one night, told me he was a friend of my brothers. He actually was in this instance, and asked me to meet him at a hotel, which I did and was recruited. You can go down to Washington, D.C., and go into one of the public CIA offices in Warrenton, Virginia and knock on the door and ask for an application.

What makes a good CIA agent? What qualities?

Well, it just depends on the kind of assignments you are going to have. Intelligence today is very, very big and very, very specialized. He can be an economist, a geographer, a physicist, a chemist, an engineer, a para-military type, a federal officer, --

What's a para-military type?

Many of these fellows come in from the services and they are, they have to be fellows who have been trained in green beret type work, paratrooper work, demolition, all the things you associate with commando type activities. This is what you want. They have got to be

strong and very confident, self-confident.

Could they have a compunction against killing?

As far as the Agency's concerned I'd say no, that they should be amoral in their attitude. When an officer has to be amoral, he cannot think in terms of good or evil, right or wrong. The job has got to be done and he needs to do what is necessary to do the job. But I don't think the CIA and I don't think the U.S. intelligence community and I don't think the U.S. should be engaged in para-military activity. If we think something going on in some country is dangerous to our national interest, we should try to handle it openly and diplomatically; if that cannot be done and we must take drastic action, I think we should do that openly, too. Go in with the Marines, the Eight-Second Airborne, the Navy, the Army, whatever, but not clandestinely try to disassociate ourselves from it publicly. That is just not the way a great nation like this should be acting.

Let me now put you on hold for a minute or two. We'll be right back.

The question I asked, I'll repeat it publicly. Have you been involved in very many interview that were as probing as this one?

No, I haven't, Don. Most of the interviews just skim over the surface. I have the feeling that you and I could sit for four or five hours. You like to go into depth on each point. This is a very probing interview, and as you can probably tell, I am stopping and thinking.

You are not uncomfortable, are you?



Not really.

That's too bad. I was hoping to get you uncomfortable. Let's get back to the question of cost. For this country to operate a viable intelligence community, I have heard various figures, and one that comes to mind most readily is the figure of 6 billion dollars. Is that a realistic figure?

That is a realistic figure and that is how much it does cost to run the national--

Six billion dollars?

Yes.

What are they using that money for?

Well, I think a lot of it is being wasted. I think we could probably do it for certainly five billion dollars a year, and my guess is we could get it down to four billion dollars a year; and if we cut out para-military activities and certain other political action programs. This is where you are manipulating international trade unions and the like for propaganda; we could probably get it down to three billion dollars.

Is the CIA manipulating international trade unions? Or the intelligence community?

Yes, they do.

To what extent?

I am not going to go into any detail on that because that is another area that needs to be looked at.

I am letting you off the hook not only because I have to, you are not going to answer, but because I think it diplomatic of me, and I am somewhat nationalistic. After all, this is my country and I don't want to be responsible for your blowing any national security. Tell me about the CIA agency itself. Is it a racist organization?

I wouldn't call it a racist organization. I'd say it is fairly--some of its attitudes toward not only race, but religion, national origin, even women, sex, is a little old-fashioned.

How do you mean that? Let's talk about race.

Well, first of all, most of the blacks who work for the Agency are in positions as guards, char force, mainly professional ranks. Very few blacks who were analysts and case officers and those that were, as of the time I left, none of them were into the higher ranks; they were in the middle ranks. Now there are \_\_?\_\_, and I think the people thoroughly believe that this was unavoidable, because it was difficult they say to clear blacks, that the Agency has very high security standards and you have to have a very thorough background investigation. To even think that blacks could be...(interrupted). Information could be turned up that a fellow had had some run-ins with the police or something or he couldn't trace back his parents. This is one of the things that...

That's archaic.

I think so. I think that this isn't very realistic in this day and age. This is all a hangover from the time when you didn't want to hire a fellow of Russian ancestry who may have parents or grandparents still living in Russia who could be used to blackmail him into becoming a double agent. But just to show you how archaic the Agency was, I guess it must have been 1962 or so, somewhere around that time. The Inspector General, in the course of one of his routine inspections of one of the components, came to the startling discovery that this one component had no Negroes, no Catholics, no Jews, nobody classed as an ethnic, and of course no female professionals in this unit. Now the people who were most amazed at this discovery were the people in this component. They just couldn't get over it. It turns up with one other discovery, that everyone in there was a liberal democrat, and these liberal democrats, many of them established in types of    ?    were aghast at this discovery. They didn't realize that their biases which were so submerged were actually showing.

Aren't you Italian?

Yes, partly.

That's incredible, the contradictions in the necessary life policy in the fact that you are part Italian, part of that ethnic mentality--

It is beginning to break down, and it is breaking down. When I was brought up to that particular component, I thought I was the token Dago.

I know the feeling well. What, tell me if you can, in as short a period as you can, about your concern that the CIA will turn toward domestic concern?

Not only the CIA, the U.S. intelligence community in general, from the way I read, I see in the newspapers and some of the things I hear they are getting very much concerned about some of the civil rights movements, the student movements, and so forth. But since I've gotten out, friends of mine working for the Agency have resigned and gone to work for a police organization. I wonder about that. There are other little things about this. In recent months there have been articles in the New York Times, Newsweek, and the like where the reporters are quoting intelligence experts as being fearful of the FBI's ability to deal with the subversive problem and with counter-espionage, the implication being that there is a great deal of this going on in the country today.

I'm sorry to interrupt you at this point, but we'll be right back. Don't go away. (pause) This is an intriguing book on espionage that I think you ought to read to learn a great deal. Much of what is in the book, I suppose, is \_\_\_\_?\_\_\_\_ of many of your experiences in CIA. Is that a fairly accurate observation?

Yes, in the sense that everything in it is based on fact, its reality, very realistic. We changed around the presentation to keep it secret.

I think people should read it; it's a most intriguing book. What are

you trying to do with your life now that you're no longer with the CIA?

We've been doing very well. We just sold the movie rights, and I am working on another novel, and when I'm back in Washington I am doing what I can behind the scenes to help certain senators get a little more control over the CIA and the U.S. intelligence community.

We have been talking a great deal to some extent about the clandestine activities of the Intelligence Gathering Community, the CIA in particular, and I'd believe anything you told me.